In attendance: James Alm, David Blumenfeld, Mary Jane Casto, Ron Colarusso, Sid Harris, Charlene Hurt, Susan Kelley, Mike Moore, Steve Kaminshine, and Charles Louis. Chaired by Ron Henry.

I. The minutes of the Deans’ Group meeting of 05/14/03 were approved without amendment.

II. Budget Update
Ron Henry reviewed the state appropriation for GSU, which increased by $350,000. He also noted future enhancements due to increases in the tuition rates. $2.1M will be placed in a holding fund to cover anticipated requested returns to the state in the future. Plans for distribution of these funds will be discussed but not allocated, although the spending authority will probably be given for future fiscal years. FACP will also examine zero-b budgeting for all administrative and academic units.

Charlene Hurt asked if seminars in zero-based budgeting could be presented. Ron Henry agreed such information should be provided. Mike Moore noted the academic units use widely differing models to obtain their funds such as supplies, etc. Sid Harris asked if the Regents might employ a new funding formula in the future budget processes. Ron Henry responded that he did not know of any current plans to do so. Steve Kaminshine asked UGA and Tech would object to the increased funding due to credit hour generation since they are close to their saturation points in enrollment. Ron Henry agreed but added that these institutions continue to feel the fiscal increases associated with recovery from semester conversion.

Sid Harris proposed that a strategic review of budgets may be more beneficial if the goal is to free up additional funds for investing in larger institutional goals. Ron Henry noted that applying some of the strategies presented in the Guskin and Marcy paper may be beneficial. He suggested examining providing student learning at lower cost, especially employing the use of technology and personnel other than TT faculty. He also indicated examining the purpose of institutional units. He estimated this type of institution review could result in approximately 5% of GSU budget ($10-12M) to be placed back in to the budget for areas such as increases in tenure track faculty numbers.

David Blumenfeld asked about the implications of such cuts. Ron Henry suggested perhaps about half of this might well result from review of administrative units, including those administrative functions within colleges/schools. He suggested the review should include asking if the increase in administrative levels has increased the productivity of the institution. David Blumenfeld asked if the number of administrative reviews, pre- and tenure review for example, have necessitated added administrative individuals. Ron Henry agreed these areas also be evaluated.

III. Guskin and Marcy Paper Discussion
Ron Henry asked the group to consider the institution’s role in community engagement. Particularly he asked how the location of GSU could be used to advantage. Susan Kelley noted the involvement of the CHHS faculty in the community could be used to influence various agencies in the professional world.

Ron Colarusso indicated the COE strives to embed students in the community as educators. Responding to Sid Harris, Ron Henry indicated he felt GSU lies in the top half of the Urban 13 institutions concerning community involvement. David Blumenfeld noted the CAS stresses international activities and connection to specific cult and ethnic communities in Atlanta.

Mike Moore noted that during strategic planning, the top Urban 13 institutions seem very confident regarding institutional image and vision regarding community involvement. Sid Harris agreed it would be useful to estal
clear description of the goals of the institution. Ron Henry indicated he felt the university might want to spend time in discussing this.

Sid Harris suggested Atlanta, as a whole, might not be very clear on the societal issues they are trying to addre
Ron Henry suggested limiting the focus on Atlanta may not give the necessary breadth to community involven
plans, and that GSU might offer to partner with Atlanta concerning community issues rather than directing the of discussions. David Blumenfeld noted the CAS deep involvement in the Greek community and stressed the listen to the community members. Steve Kaminshine stated the university could, through local community involvement, develop models that could be applied to other global communities.

Charlene Hurt commented that ARCHE might have provided some documents that may be useful to inform th discussion concerning community involvement. The group indicated several community programs currently in naming "Project Healthy Grandparents" as one example.

Ron Henry asked the group what priority community involvement should have in the university and what rewa structure and recognition should be in place for involvement. Susan Kelley asked for a more centralized mann keeping track of university community involvement projects. Mike Moore noted an absence of documentation on learning engagement and service programs and courses. Charles Louis noted the IRB could be used to assess the level of involvement with study populations from a research prospective.

David Blumenfeld indicated modern international languages have been added to the curriculum with student a faculty exchange systems for experiential learning. Charlene Hurt emphasized the need for the university of the definition of student learning. Susan Kelley supported Mike Moore’s comment regarding student involvement as just faculty community involvement. Sid Harris asked if students are adequately recognized for community engagement. Steve Kaminshine indicated many law schools have adopted mandatory community involvement terms of pro bono activities. Mike Moore noted some students attain certificates in some areas and place this on the transcript. Sid Harris also asked if students are also recognized for GSU community involvement. He stressed that Honor’s Day may be a venue to more often recognize these students. Charlene Hurt noted the level of volunteerism that students show at the high school level as an added dimension for their college admission, and indicated the university may consider continuing to encourage these activities at the university.

Ron Henry indicated he would follow up this discussion to examine increased community involvement and its priority in the university’s function. Susan Kelley added that the definition of community should include invol with state and local governments. Ron Colarusso indicated the current reward structure in place could suppor community activities. Charles Louis noted the various agencies and institutions available in Atlanta should als considered as a part of the definition of “community”. Steve Kaminshine emphasized the need to examine rev that may not be directly linked to scholarship (or perceived as such). David Blumenfeld stressed the need to remember development opportunities involved as a consequence of community involvement.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, June 11, 9:30 to 11:30 am, Room 200, Golden Key Board Room, Student Center.
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